arXiv:1606.04899v1 [math.DG] 15 Jun 2016

A MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE FOR HYPERSURFACES IN $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ WITH A IDEAL CONTACT AT INFINITY AND BOUNDED MEAN CURVATURE

J. DEIBSOM DA SILVA AND A. F. DE SOUSA

ABSTRACT. We will generalize a Maximum Principle at Infinity in the parabolic case given in [1] by Ronald F. de Lima and Ronaldo F. de Lima and William Meeks in [2] for disjoints hypersurfaces M_1 and M_2 of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and bounded mean curvature without restrictions on the Gaussian Curvature. We will also extend for hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ a generalization of Hopf's Maximum Principle for hypersurfaces that get close asymptotically.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the classical results in Differential Geometry is Hopf's Maximum Principle for Hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, which states that under certain conditions related to the Mean Curvature, if two hypersurfaces M_1 and M_2 are tangent at a interior point $p \in M_1 \cap M_2$ and this point is a Ideal Contact p (see definition in 2.2), then they coincide in a neighbourhood of p (Theorem 2.1).

Thinking about this type of contact between two hypersurfaces, the authors of [1] and [2] established an ideal contact between two disjoints surfaces M_1 and M_2 in $\mathbb{R}^3$, which generalizes the *Ideal Contact in p* for disjoints surfaces that get close each other in an assymptotic behavior. This approximation was name *Ideal Contact at infinity* (see Definition 3.1).

Assuming an *Ideal Contact at Infinity* between the surfaces M_1 and M_2 in $\mathbb{R}^3$, the author of [1] demonstrates the following **Maximum Principle at Infinity** for surfaces with bounded Gaussian curvature and constant Mean Curvature $H \neq 0$:

Theorem 1.1. *Let M_1 e M_2 be two disjoints H-surfaces, complete, properly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$, with bounded Gaussian Curvature and non-empty boundaries ∂M_1 and ∂M_2. If M_1 and M_2 have an ideal contact at infinity and either M_1 or M_2 is parabolic, then*

$$min\{dist(M_1, \partial M_2), dist(M_2, \partial M_1)\} = 0.$$

Date: June 16, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53A10, 53A07.

Key words and phrases. Maximum Principle at infinity, Ideal contact at infinity, convex side.

In 2004, Ronaldo F. de Lima, author of [1], along with William Meeks managed to prove in [2] the following non-parabolic version with bounded Gaussian and Mean Curvatures of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. *Let M_1 be a surface with boundary ∂M_1 and bounded Gaussian curvature, which is properly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and whose mean curvature satisfies $b_0 \leq H_{M_1} \leq b_1$, $b_0, b_1 > 0$. Assume M_2 is a surface with boundary ∂M_2, which is properly immersed in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and such that $|H_{M_2}| \leq b_0$. Then, if M_2 has an contact ideal at infinity wich M_1, one has*

$$min\{dist(M_1, \partial M_2), dist(M_2, \partial M_1)\} = 0.$$

As an application of Theorem 1.2 the authors also proved in [2] the following theorem, which generalizes Hopf's Maximum Principle for surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with an ideal contact at infinity and bounded Gaussian and mean curvatures:

Theorem 1.3. *Let's suppose that M_1 is a surface properly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$ without boundary and of bounded Gaussian Curvature. Then, if the Mean Curvature of M_1 satifies $b_0 \leq H_{M_1} \leq b_1$, $b_0, b_1 > 0$, the surface without boundary M_2, which is properly immersed in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and whose mean curvature satisfies $|H_{M_2}| \leq b_0$, can not be in the convex side of M_1.*

In [1] Ronaldo F. de Lima proved the parabolic version of Theorem 1.3 assuming M_1 and M_2 H-surfaces, $H \neq 0$.

Our objective in this article is to extend to hypersurfaces of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ the Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. It will be done in Theorem 3.1 when we prove the Maximum Principle at Infinity for disjoints hypersurfaces M_1 and M_2 in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, properly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and non-empty boundary. To do that, we will suppose that M_2 is complete and that $\sup_{M_2} |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| \leq \inf_{M_1} \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n)$, where $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n$ are the main curvatures of M_1 and $\mathbf{H}_{M_2}$ is the mean curvature vector of M_2. We will also assume that M_2 and M_1 has an ideal contact at infinity and that M_2 is parabolic. However, we won't consider any hypothesis about the Gaussian curvature of any hypersurface. We will need two lemmas that will be proved in section 3, the lemmas 3.1 and 3.2.

As an application of Theorem 3.1 we will prove the Theorem 4.1, which is a generalization of Hopf's Maximum Principle for hypersurfaces with an ideal contact, which extends the Theorem 1.3. Such theorem states that under certain conditions like the ones in Theorem 3.1, if M_2 has empty boundary then it cannot be on the convex side of M_1. And in Theorem 4.2 we will extend Theorem 4.1 to the case where $M_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ is a hypersurface and $M_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ a parabolic n-submanifold, which generalizes the Theorem 4 in [3] for asymptotic hypersurfaces.

In Theorem 4.3, as in its corollarys, we used the Omory-Yau's Maximum Principle and prove an analog result to Theorem 4.1 without the hypothesis of $M_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a parabolic hypersurface, obtaining another generalization of

Hopf's Maximum Principle for hypersurfaces of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with an ideal contact at infinity.

As a consequence of Theorem 4.3, we obtained in Corollary 4.2 an analog result for $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$, $k \geq 2$, to Theorem 1.4 below, proven by Langevin and Rosenberg in [4].

Theorem 1.4. *Let M_1 and M_2 two disjoint surfaces, complete, minimal and embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with finite total curvature and compact boundaries. Then, $dist(M_1, M_2) > 0$.*

2. Notation and preliminaries

2.1. **Notation.** Given a smooth and oriented hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we will denote the mean Curvature function and the mean curvature vector of M as H_M and $\mathbf{H}_M$, respectively. We will also denote as ∇^M and Δ^M its gradient and Laplacian, respectively.

2.2. **Preliminaries.** Let M^n be an n-dimensional Riemannian manifold with smooth possibly empty boundary ∂M and $\Omega \subset M$ a open set of M. A function $f \in C^2(\Omega)$ is *harmonic* if $\Delta^M f = 0$. We say that a continuous function h in Ω is *subharmonic* if, for all precompact $U \subset\subset \Omega$ and every harmonic function $f \in C^2(U) \cap C^0(\overline{U})$, $h \leq f$ in ∂U then $h \leq f$ in U.

Subharmonic functions satisfy the following maximum principle: Suppose that $\Omega \subset M$ is precompact and h is a subharmonic function in Ω. Then

$$\sup_{\Omega} h = \sup_{\partial\Omega} h.$$

Using the maximum principle we deduce that the subharmonicity of a function $h \in C^2(\Omega)$ is equivalent to $\Delta^M h \geq 0$.

When a Riemannian manifold M has a non-empty boundary ∂M we'll say that M is parabolic if it cannot exist a non-constant upper bounded subharmonic function. In the case when ∂M is non-empty will use the following definition of parabolic manifold given by Ronaldo F. de Lima in [1], which will be essential in our results.

Definition 2.1. *A n-dimensional Riemannian manifold M^n, complete, with non-empty smooth boundary ∂M is named **parabolic** if, for any subharmonic function h in M, upper bounded we have*

$$\sup_{M} h = \sup_{\partial M} h.$$

In [13] the authors proved that if $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, the notion of parabolicity as a Riemannian Manifold that does not admit a subharmonic function, non-constant, upper bounded, implies in the Definition 2.1 above.

Next, we will state a proposition of fundamental importance in the demonstration of our main result, whose demonstration will be found in [1]. In the following, M^n is a n-dimensional Riemannian manifold, complete, with a possibly empty smooth boundary ∂M and $M' \subset M$ a n-dimensional Riemannian

submanifold of M, complete, embedded and with non-empty smooth boundary $\partial M'$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let M and M' be like above. Then M' is parabolic if M is parabolic.*

We will also use the following lemma, found in [5].

Lemma 2.1. *Let A be a quadratic form in a n-dimensional euclidian vectorial space with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_k \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n$. Then for any k-dimensional subspace $W \subset V$ we have*

$$trA\,|_W \geq \lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k.$$

Comparing to the maximum principle, we will define next the ideal contact at a point (Definition 2.2) and show Hopf's Maximum Principle (Theorem 2.1) which, according to the author of [1], it was what inspired him to think about an ideal contact at infinit (see Definition 3.1) for hypersurfaces.

Definition 2.2 (Ideal Contact at p)**.** *Let M_1 and M_2 two oriented hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. If M_1 and M_2 are tangent at an interior point p and has the same unit normal η_0 at p , we will say that they have an **Ideal contact at** p. We will also say that M_1 lies above M_2 near a p related to η_0, if when we express M_1 and M_2 as graphics of function ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 over the tangent hyperplan in p we have $\phi_1 \geq \phi_2$ in a neighbourghood of p.*

Theorem 2.1 (Hopf's Maximum Principle)**.** *Let M_1 and M_2 be oriented hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ which have a contact at a point p. Let H_{M_1} and H_{M_2} be their mean Curvarture function, respectively. If $H_{M_1} \leq H_{M_2}$ at p then M_1 cannot lie above M_2, unless they coincide in a neighborhood of p.*

3. The Maximum Principle at Infinity for hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$

In this section we will state the main result of this paper. Here we are suppose $M_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a oriented smooth hypersurface with positive mean Curvature H_{M_1}.

Theorem 3.1. *Let M_1 and M_2 two disjoints hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, propperly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and non-empty boundaries ∂M_1 and ∂M_2. Suppose that M_2 is complete and that*

$$\sup_{M_2} |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| \leq \inf_{M_1} \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n). \tag{1}$$

If M_2 has an ideal contact at infinity with M_1 and is parabolic, then

$$min\{dist(M_1, \partial M_2), dist(M_2, \partial M_1)\} = 0 \tag{2}$$

Such theorem is a generalization of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 which is by itself a remarkable result, its demonstration leads us to Theorem 4.1 which is a generalization of Hopf's Maximum Principle in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ for hypersurfaces with an ideal contact at infinity (see definition 3.1) in a way that they are disjoints hypersurfaces that approach each other asymptotically.

The definition of ideal contact at infinity was introduce by the author of [1] with a second version in [2], the one we will use here.

Definition 3.1 (Ideal contact at infinity)**.** *Let M_1 be a propperly embedded hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ with a positive mean Curvature function. We say that a n-dimensional submanifold $M_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ has an **ideal contact at infinity** with M_1 if M_1 and M_2 are disjoints and there are sequences of interior points $y_i \in M_1$, $x_i \in M_2$ and $\lambda_i > 0$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, with*

$$|y_i - x_i| \to 0 \qquad e \qquad x_i - y_i = \lambda_i \mathbf{H}_{M_1}(y_i)$$

always when $i \to \infty$.

In the demonstration of Theorem 3.1 we will use the Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, that need the following assumptions: Let $M_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ a hypersurface, at least C^2, with mean Curvature H_{M_1} according to the unit normal η. We will denote by

$$\Lambda_n := \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n)$$

the n-nth mean curvature in respect to η, where $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \cdots \leq \lambda_{n+k-1}$ are the main curvatures of M_1 with respect to η. Also let $M_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ be a n-dimensional C^2 submanifold, $n \geq 1$, with mean curvature vector

$$\mathbf{H}_{M_2} = -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{r=1}^{k}(\mathrm{div}\eta^r)\eta^r$$

where $\eta^1, \cdots, \eta^k$ are orthonormal vector fields normal to M_2.

Let d be the distance function $d(x) := dist(x, M_1)$. Such function is of class C^2 in a neighborhood of M_1, Lipschitz with consant 1 and is oriented by the choice of η, meaning that $\eta(y) = Dd(x)$, where $y \in M_1$ is such that $|x-y| = d(x)$ and $D = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}, \ldots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{n+k}}\right)$ is the gradient of $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ (see [3] or [6]). This way, the point x is such as $x = y + d(x)\eta(y)$.

For each x close to M_1 we will consider a parallel hypersurface

$$M_{1d(x)} = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} : d(p) = d(x)\} = d^{-1}(d(x))$$

such hypersurfaces are of class C^2 and have main curvatures in x_0 given by(see [3] or [6])

$$\frac{\lambda_1(y_0)}{1-\lambda_1 d(x_0)} \leq \frac{\lambda_2(y_0)}{1-\lambda_2 d(x_0)} \leq \cdots \leq \frac{\lambda_{n+k-1}(y_0)}{1-\lambda_{n+k-1} d(x_0)}$$

where $y_0 \in M_1$ is such that $|x_0 - y_0| = d(x_0)$ and $\lambda_1(y_0) \leq \lambda_2(y_0) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{n+k-1}(y_0)$ are the main curvatures of M_1 at y_0 if $|d| << 1$. Observe that this

give us

$$\frac{1}{n}\left(\frac{\lambda_1(y_0)}{1-\lambda_1 d(x_0)}+\frac{\lambda_2(y_0)}{1-\lambda_2 d(x_0)}+\cdots+\frac{\lambda_n(y_0)}{1-\lambda_n d(x_0)}\right)\geq\frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1+\cdots+\lambda_n)$$

for any hypersurface M_{1d}. In other words, the n-mean curvature $\Lambda_n(x_0)$ of M_{1d} at x_0 is not smaller than the n-mean curvature of M_1 at y_0.

In the following let $e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_n$ a orthonormal basis of T_xM_2 and denote by

$$e_i^T := e_i - \langle e_i, \eta\rangle\eta$$

the orthogonal projection of e_i over the tangent space T_xM_{1d}. Also let $T_xM_2^T$ be the orthogonal projection space of T_xM_2 over T_xM_{1d}. Finally, let II_d and A_d be the second fundamental form and the shape operator of M_{1d}, respectively, with respect to η.

The following lemma is an adaptation of Lemma 1 in [3], with an analogue demonstration.

Lemma 3.1. *Let M_1 and M_2 like above and d the distance function $d(x) = dist(x, M_1)$. Suppose that M_2 has an ideal contact at infinity with M_1. So, we have*

$$\Delta^{M_2}d - \sum_{i,j}^{n}\sigma_{ij}II_d(e_i^T, e_j^T) - n\langle\mathbf{H}_{M_2}, Dd\rangle + trA_d\mid_{T_xM_2^T} = 0$$

where $\sigma_{ij} = \dfrac{\nabla^{M_2}_{e_i}d\nabla^{M_2}_{e_j}d}{1-|\nabla^{M_2}d|^2}$ *and* $\nabla^{M_2}_{e_i}$ *it is the derivative in the direction of* e_i.

Proof. Let $x \in M_2$ such that $d(x) << 1$. Such point exists because M_2 has an ideal contact at infinity with M_1. Then, if $\eta^1, \cdots, \eta^k$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_xM_2^{\perp}$ and $Dd = \eta$ is the euclidian gradient of d, we have that

$$\nabla^{M_2}d = Dd - \langle Dd, \eta^1\rangle\eta^1 - \cdots - \langle Dd, \eta^k\rangle\eta^k$$

that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^{M_2}d &= \mathrm{div}\nabla^{M_2}d &&= \mathrm{div}Dd - \sum_{r=1}^{k}\langle Dd, \eta^r\rangle\mathrm{div}\eta^r \\ &&&= \mathrm{div}Dd + n\langle\mathbf{H}_{M_2}, Dd^{\perp}\rangle\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $Dd^{\perp} = \langle Dd, \eta^1\rangle\eta^1 + \cdots + \langle Dd, \eta^k\rangle\eta^k$ is the normal component of $\eta = Dd$ relative to M_2 and $\mathbf{H}_{M_2} = -\dfrac{1}{n}\sum_{r=1}^{k}(\mathrm{div}\eta^r)\eta^r$ is the vector mean curvature of M_2.

Denote $\overline{\nabla}_{e_i}$ as the euclidian directional derivative in the direction of e_i. Then, as

$$e_i = e_i^T + \langle e_i, \eta\rangle\eta, \text{ and } |\eta|^2 = 1$$

we have from (3) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^{M_2}d &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\langle e_i,\overline{\nabla}_{e_i}\eta\rangle + n\langle \mathbf{H}_{M_2}, Dd^{\perp}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\langle e_i^T,\overline{\nabla}_{e_i^T}\eta\rangle + n\langle \mathbf{H}_{M_2}, Dd^{\perp}\rangle \\ &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n} II_d(e_i^T,e_i^T) + n\langle \mathbf{H}_{M_2}, Dd^{\perp}\rangle\end{aligned}$$

and as $Dd = \nabla^{M_2}d + Dd^{\perp}$, we have that

$$\Delta^{M_2}d - n\langle \mathbf{H}_{M_2}, Dd\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{n} II_d(e_i^T,e_i^T) = 0. \tag{4}$$

Now, let $y \in M_1$ such that $|x-y| = d(x) << 1$. As M_1 and M_2 approach each other asymptotically because M_2 has an ideal contact at infinity with M_1, the hyperplans T_xM_2 and T_yM_1 are almost parallels, which are almost parallels to T_xM_{1d}, therefore the tangent component $\nabla^{M_2}d$ of Dd in T_xM_2 is very close to zero, i.e., $|\nabla^{M_2}d| << 1$ if $dist(M_1,M_2)$ is sufficient small (see [1]). Then, if we put

$$\begin{aligned}g_{ij} &:= \langle e_i^T, e_j^T\rangle = \langle e_i - \langle e_i,\eta\rangle\eta, e_j - \langle e_j,\eta\rangle\eta\rangle \\ &= \delta_{ij} - \langle e_i,\eta\rangle\langle e_j,\eta\rangle\end{aligned}$$

and as $|\nabla^{M_2}d| < 1$, we have that g^{ij}, the inverse of g_{ij} is given by

$$g^{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \frac{\langle e_i,\eta\rangle\langle e_j,\eta\rangle}{1-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\langle e_i,\eta\rangle^2} =: \delta_{ij} + \sigma_{ij}.$$

And then, the trace of A_d in ${T_xM_2}^T$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}trA_d\,|_{{T_xM_2}^T} &= \sum_{i,j}^{n} g^{ij} II_d(e_i^T,e_j^T) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} II_d(e_i^T,e_i^T) + \sum_{i,j}^{n}\sigma_{ij} II_d(e_i^T,e_j^T).\end{aligned}$$

From (4) we have

$$\Delta^{M_2}d - n\langle \mathbf{H}_{M_2}, Dd\rangle + trA_d\,|_{{T_xM_2}^T} - \sum_{i,j}^{n}\sigma_{ij} II_d(e_i^T,e_j^T) = 0. \tag{5}$$

And the lemma goes on observing that

$$\langle e_i,\eta\rangle = \langle e_i, Dd\rangle = \langle e_i,\nabla^{M_2}d\rangle + \langle e_i, Dd^{\perp}\rangle = \langle e_i,\nabla^{M_2}d\rangle = \nabla^{M_2}_{e_i}d$$

and

$$\nabla^{M_2}d = \sum_{i=1}^{n}(\nabla^{M_2}_{e_i}d)e_i$$

and then

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{\langle e_i, \eta\rangle\langle e_j, \eta\rangle}{1-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\langle e_i, \eta\rangle^2} = \frac{\nabla^{M_2}_{e_i} d \nabla^{M_2}_{e_j} d}{1-|\nabla^{M_2} d|^2}.$$

□

Lemma 3.2. *Let M_1 and M_2 be like Lemma 3.1 and $d(x) = dist(x, M_1)$. Suppose that M_2 has an ideal contact at infinity with M_1 and that*

$$\sup_{M_2} |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| \leq \inf_{M_1} \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n) = \inf_{M_1} \Lambda_n.$$

Then we have that

$$\Delta^{M_2} d - C_0 |\nabla^{M_2} d|^2 \leq 0$$

for some positive constant C_0.

Proof. First we will prove that

$$-n\langle \mathbf{H}_{M_2}, Dd\rangle + trA_d\,|_{T_x M_2^T} \geq 0. \tag{6}$$

By the Lemma 2.1 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} trA_d\,|_{T_x M_2^T} &\geq \frac{1}{n}\left(\frac{\lambda_1(y)}{1-\lambda_1 d(x)} + \frac{\lambda_2(y)}{1-\lambda_2 d(x)} + \cdots + \frac{\lambda_n(y)}{1-\lambda_n d(x)}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1(y) + \cdots + \lambda_n(y)) \end{aligned}$$

where $y \in M_1$ is such that $|x-y| = d(x) << 1$ e $\lambda_1(y), \cdots, \lambda_n(y)$ are the n first main curvatures of M_1. As we supposed that

$$\sup_{M_2} |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| \leq \inf_{M_1} \Lambda_n$$

We conclude that $\frac{1}{n} trA_d\,|_{T_x M_2^T} \geq |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}|$ and by the Schwarz Inequality, we have that

$$\langle \mathbf{H}_{M_2}, Dd\rangle \leq |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}||Dd| = |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}|$$

because $Dd = \eta$ and (6) follows.

For the sake of simplicity of notation we will make $\nabla^{M_2}_{e_i} d = d_i$. Let σ_{ij} given in Lemma 3.1, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j}^{n} \sigma_{ij} II_d(e_i^T, e_j^T) &= \sum_{i,j}^{n} \frac{II_d(e_i^T, e_j^T) d_i d_j}{1-|\nabla^{M_2} d|^2} \\ &= \sum_{i,j}^{n} \frac{II_d(d_i e_i^T, d_j e_j^T)}{1-|\nabla^{M_2} d|^2} \\ &= \frac{II_d((\nabla^{M_2} d)^T, (\nabla^{M_2} d)^T)}{1-|\nabla^{M_2} d|^2} \\ &\leq C_0 |\nabla^{M_2} d|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

for a positive constant C_0. From $|\nabla^{M_2} d| << 1$ we conclude the inequality of (7), because M_2 has an ideal contact at infinity with M_1. Using now (5), (6) and (7), we conclude the lemma.

□

The demonstration of Theorem 3.1 is similar to the demonstration in the case where we have H-surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ given in Theorem 1 in [1]. The differential between them lies in the demonstrations of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 above, which equivalents in [1] are the Lemmas 3 and 4, respectively. These will allow us to construct in a convenient set a subharmonic function and assuming the theorem is false we will reach a contradiction related to the parabolicity of M_2.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let's suppose that (2) is false, i.e.,

$$m_0 = min\{dist(M_1, \partial M_2), dist(M_2, \partial M_1)\} > 0.$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficient small, let

$$M_2(\varepsilon) = \{x \in M_2 : dist(x, M_1) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

For each $x \in M_2(\varepsilon)$, consider the set

$$S_x = \{y \in M_1 : |y - x| = dist(x, M_1) \ \ and \ \ x - y = \lambda \mathbf{H}_{M_1}(y), \ \ \lambda > 0\}$$

and finally define the set $M_2'(\varepsilon) \subset M_2(\varepsilon)$ as

$$M_2'(\varepsilon) = \{x \in M_2(\varepsilon) : S_x \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Note that $M_2'(\varepsilon)$ is non-empty because M_1 and M_2 are propperly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and have an ideal contact at infinity. Let $C_2(\varepsilon) \subset M_2'(\varepsilon)$ be a conex component of $M_2'(\varepsilon)$. Now take $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $m_o > \varepsilon$. From that last assumption we have that $\partial M_2 \cap C_2(\varepsilon) = \emptyset$. In fact, if otherwise we had $x \in C_2(\varepsilon) \subset M_2'(\varepsilon)$ we would have $dist(x, M_1) \leq \varepsilon$ and $x \in \partial M_2$ we would have $dist(x, M_1) > \varepsilon$, because $dist(M_1, \partial M_2) > \varepsilon$, which give us

$$\partial C_2(\varepsilon) = \{x \in C_2(\varepsilon) : dist(x, M_1) = \varepsilon\}.$$

Consider now the distance function $d(x) = dist(x, M_1)$. By the lemma 3.2 we have that

$$\Delta^{M_2} d - C_0 |\nabla^{M_2} d|^2 \leq 0 \tag{8}$$

for a positive constant C_0. Observe that $d\,|_{\partial C_2(\varepsilon)} \equiv \varepsilon$. We also have that $C_2(\varepsilon)$ is not compact, otherwise we would have a x' in the interior of $C_2(\varepsilon)$ such that $d(x')$ would be minimum, and in this case $\nabla^{M_2} d(x') = 0$ and by (8) we would have $\Delta^{M_2} d(x') \leq 0$, contrary to the fact that x' is a inferior minimum point. So $C_2(\varepsilon)$ is not compact and $\sup_{C_2(\varepsilon)} d = \varepsilon$.

Consider now a function ϕ in $C_2(\varepsilon)$ given by

$$\phi(x) = e^{-C_0 d(x)}.$$

Calculating $\Delta^{M_2}\phi$ using (8), we will have that

$$\Delta^{M_2}\phi = -C_0 e^{-C_0 d}(\Delta^{M_2} d - C_0|\nabla^{M_2} d|^2) \geq 0$$

from which we can conclude that ϕ is subharmonic in $C_2(\varepsilon)$. As we are assuming that M_2 is parabolic, we have by the Proposition 2.1 that $C_2(\varepsilon)$ is parabolic. So we should have

$$\sup_{C_2(\varepsilon)} \phi = \sup_{\partial C_2(\varepsilon)} \phi = e^{-C_0\varepsilon}$$

which is a contradition because $\sup_{C_2(\varepsilon)} \phi = 1 > e^{-C_0\varepsilon} = \sup_{\partial C_2(\varepsilon)} \phi$. As this contradition came from the assumption that $m_0 > 0$, we have that

$$min\{dist(M_1, \partial M_2), dist(M_2, \partial M_1)\} = 0$$

and the proof is complete. □

Remark 3.1. *Since the Proposition 2.1 is valid when $\partial M_2 = \emptyset$ we have that the Theorem 3.1 remains valid if $\partial M_2 = \emptyset$, in this case we have that (2) remain $dist(M_2, \partial M_1) = 0$.*

Remark 3.2. *If we suppose that M_2 is a compact hypersurface, we can withdraw the hypothesis of parabolicity in Theorem 3.1 and enunciate the Theorem 3.2 next, using now the Divergence Theorem in its demonstration.*

Theorem 3.2. *Let M_1 and M_2 be two disjoints hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, properly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with non-empty boundaries ∂M_1 and ∂M_2. Assume that M_2 is compact and that*

$$\sup_{M_2} |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| < \inf_{M_1} \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n). \tag{9}$$

If M_2 has an ideal contact at infinity with M_1 then

$$min\{dist(M_1, \partial M_2), dist(M_2, \partial M_1)\} = 0 \tag{10}$$

Proof. In fact, assuming (9), the demonstration of the Lemma 3.2 give us that

$$\Delta^{M_2} d - C_0|\nabla^{M_2} d|^2 < 0, \tag{11}$$

for some positive constante C_0, where $d(x) = dist(x, M_1)$. Suppose now that the Theorem is false, i.e., that

$$min\{dist(M_1, \partial M_2), dist(M_2, \partial M_1)\} > 0.$$

Let $C_2(\varepsilon)$ and $\phi(x) = e^{-C_0 d(x)}$ be like in the demonstration of the Theorem 3.1. So, from (11) that

$$\Delta^{M_2}\phi = -C_0\phi(\Delta^{M_2} d - C_0|\nabla^{M_2} d|^2) > 0,$$

and calculating $\nabla^{M_2}\phi$ we will find

$$\nabla^{M_2}\phi = -C_0 e^{-C_0 d}\nabla^{M_2} d = -C_0\phi\nabla^{M_2} d.$$

By the Divergence Theorem, if ν is the exterior unit normal alongside $\partial C_2(\varepsilon)$, so

$$0 < \int_{C_2(\varepsilon)} \Delta^{M_2}\phi = \int_{\partial C_2(\varepsilon)} \langle \nabla^{M_2}\phi, \nu\rangle = -C_0 \int_{\partial C_2(\varepsilon)} \phi \langle \nabla^{M_2} d, \nu\rangle = 0 \tag{12}$$

because d is constant alongside $\partial C_2(\varepsilon)$. And with this contradition obtained from (12) the proof is complete. □

4. Geometric Applications

Let $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a complete hypersurface, propperly embedded and empty boundary. We say that M is convex with respect to the unit normal η if its mean curvature function is positive. Observe that M splits $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ in two connected component. We will define as *convex side* of M the component of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ to which the mean curvature vector points at.

As a consequence of the demonstration of the Theorem 3.1 we have the following theorem that extends to $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, without assumptions about the Gaussian curvature, the Corollary 1 in [1] and the Theorem 3.4 in [2], with a similar demonstration. It also extends, in the parabolic case, the Theorem 1 in [9].

Theorem 4.1. *Let M_1 and M_2 be two disjoints hypersurfaces of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, propperly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, with empty boundary and assume $H_{M_1} > 0$. Suppose that M_2 is complete and that*

$$\sup_{M_2} |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| \leq \inf_{M_1} \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n).$$

If M_2 is parabolic, it cannot lie in the convex side of M_1.

Proof. Suppose that M_2 is in the convex side of M_1. If $dist(M_1, M_2) = 0$ then M_1 and M_2 have an ideal contact at infinty. In this case we can proceed with the demonstration of Theorem 3.1 defining for an $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently close to zero, the sets

$$M_2(\varepsilon) = \{x \in M_2 : dist(x, M_1) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

For each $x \in M_2(\varepsilon)$, consider the sets

$$S_x = \{y \in M_1 : |y - x| = dist(x, M_1) \ \ e \ \ x - y = \lambda \mathbf{H}_{M_1}(y), \ \ \lambda > 0\}$$

and $M_2'(\varepsilon) \subset M_2(\varepsilon)$ given by

$$M_2'(\varepsilon) = \{x \in M_2(\varepsilon) : S_x \neq \emptyset\}.$$

If $C_2(\varepsilon) \subset M_2'(\varepsilon)$ is a connected component of $M_2'(\varepsilon)$, we will have that

$$\partial C_2(\varepsilon) = \{x \in C_2(\varepsilon) : dist(x, M_1) = \varepsilon\}.$$

because we are assuming that $\partial M_2 = \emptyset$. And finally, defining in $C_2(\varepsilon)$ the function $\phi(x) = e^{-C_0 d(x)}$, where $d(x) = dist(x, M_1)$, we will get to the same contradition of Theorem 3.1, because we are assuming that M_2 is parabolic. So, M_2 cannot lie in the convex side of M_1 if $dist(M_1, M_2) = 0$.

If $dist(M_1,M_2) > 0$, there are sequences $y_n \in M_1$ and $x_n \in M_2$ in a way that the sequence $y_n - x_n$ have a subsequence that converges to a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with $|v| = dist(M_1,M_2)$. So let $\overline{M}_2 = M_2 + v$. In this way, we have that $dist(M_1,\overline{M}_2) = 0$ and that $M_1 \cap \overline{M}_2 \neq \emptyset$. Let $p \in M_1 \cap \overline{M}_2$, as $|v| = dist(M_1,M_2)$ and M_2 is in the convex side of M_1, we have that M_1 and $\overline{M}_2$ have an ideal contact at p. By Hopf'S Maximum Principle, M_1 and $\overline{M}_2$ coincide in a neighbourhood of p. That means that M_1 differs from M_2 by a translation in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ of length $|v| = dist(M_1,M_2)$. As the line segment that starts in M_1 and ends in M_2, whose length is $dist(M_1,M_2)$, is orthogonal to both M_1 and M_2, we have that in this neighborhood of p, M_1 and M_2 are parallels hyperplans, contradicting the hyptothesis that the mean curvature function of M_1 is postive. Then, if $dist(M_1,M_2) > 0$, M_2 cannot lie in the convex side of M_1, which proves the Theorem. □

Remark 4.1. *Generally, a hypersurface $M_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ with main curvatures $\lambda_1 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{n+k-1}$ with respect to the unit normal η is called n-convex mean with respect to unit normal η if $\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n \geq 0$. Then the demonstration of Theorem 4.1 above actually give as the following theorem, with a similar demonstration.*

Theorem 4.2. *Let M_1 a hypersurface of $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ whose mean curvature function is postive and M_2 a n-dimensional C^2-submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$. Also let M_1 and M_2 be disjoints, propperly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ with empty boundariues. Suppose that M_2 is complete and that*

$$\sup_{M_2} |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| \leq \inf_{M_1} \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n).$$

If M_2 is parabolic, it cannot lie in the convex side of M_1.

This last theorem is the version with an ideal contact at infinity of the Theorem 4 in [3] in the case when M_2 is parabolic and it is called there *A barrier principle for submanifolds of arbitrary codimension and bounded mean curvature*, see also in [5] the case for minimal submanifolds.

Adding an appropriate hypothesis about the Ricci curvature of M_2 hypersurface, we can withdraw its condition of parabolicity on Theorem 4.1 and obtain an analog result given in Theorem 4.3 soon. Before, we will demonstrate the Lemma 4.1 below.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ be a properly embedded hypersurface and A its shape operator. Let's define $d_j = d(x_j) = dist(x_j,M)$, where $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ it is a sequence of points such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} d_j = 0$, and A_j as the shape operator of M in $y_j \in M$, such that $|x_j - y_j| = d_j$. Suppose that*

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty} \|A_j\| < \infty.$$

If II_{d_j} is the second fundamental form of the parallel hypersurface $M_{d_j} = d^{-1}(d_j)$ in $T_{x_j}M_{d_j}$, then

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \|II_{d_j}\| < \infty.$$

Proof. If A_{d_j} is the shape operator of M_{d_j} then we have the Riccati's equation, see [14],

$$\overline{\nabla}_{Dd}A_{d_j} + A_{d_j}^2 + \overline{R}(\cdot\,, Dd)Dd = 0 \tag{13}$$

where $\overline{\nabla}$ and $\overline{R}$ are the Riemannian connection and the tensor curvature of the $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$, respectively. For $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ such that $d_j << 1$ consider the normalized geodesic minimizer $\gamma : [0, d_j] \to \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ with $\gamma(0) = y_j \in M$ and $\gamma(d_j) = x_j \in M_{d_j}$. As γ is a line segment joining y_j to x_j and $d_j << 1$, then $\gamma'(t) = Dd$ if $t \in [0, d_j]$. Let $v \in T_{x_j}M_{d_j}$ and V its parallel transport alongside γ with $V(0) = v_0 \in T_{y_j}M$. Denoting by $'$ the derivative alongside γ we have

$$\langle A_{d_j}(V), V\rangle' = \langle \overline{\nabla}_{\gamma'} A_{d_j}(V), V\rangle = \langle \overline{\nabla}_{Dd} A_{d_j}(V), V\rangle.$$

Thus, by (13)

$$\langle A_{d_j}(V), V\rangle' = -\langle A_{d_j}^2(V), V\rangle - \langle \overline{R}(V, Dd)Dd, V\rangle.$$

Therefore in $d_j = 0$ we have

$$\langle A_{d_j}(V), V\rangle' \,|_{d_j=0} = -\langle A_j^2(v_0), v_0\rangle - \langle \overline{R}(v_0, \eta)\eta, v_0\rangle.$$

Thus, the Taylor expansion of $II_{d_j}(v) = \langle A_{d_j}(v), v\rangle$ around second fundamental form $II_j = II_{d_j}\,|_{d_j=0}$ of M it is given by

$$\langle A_{d_j}(v), v\rangle = \langle A_j(v_0), v_0\rangle - [\langle A_j^2(v_0), v_0\rangle + \langle \overline{R}(v_0, \eta)\eta, v_0\rangle]d_j + O(d_j^2) \tag{14}$$

Being the sectional curvature of $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ null, we have from (14) that

$$|II_{d_j}(v)| \leq \|A_j\||v_0|^2 + \|A_j\|^2|v_0|^2 d_j + O(d_j^2). \tag{15}$$

Therefore from (15)

$$\|II_{d_j}\| \leq \|A_j\| + \|A_j\|^2 d_j + O(d_j^2). \tag{16}$$

As $j \to \infty$ in (16) we have what we wanted. □

Theorem 4.3. *Let M_1 and M_2 be two disjoints hypersurfaces, without boundary and properly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Assume that M_2 is complete with Ricci curvature satisfying*

$$Ric_{M_2} \geq -(n-1)R_0,\ R_0 > 0.$$

Let $d(x) = dist(x, M_1)$ and A_j as in Lemma 4.1 and suppose that

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty} \|A_j\| < \infty \tag{17}$$

for every sequence $x_j \in M_2$ such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} d(x_j) = \inf_{M_2} dist(x, M_1)$. If

$$\sup_{M_2} |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| < \inf_{M_1} \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n), \tag{18}$$

then M_2 it connot lie in the convex side of M_1.

Proof. By Omori-Yau's Maximum Principle, with the version for the minimum, there is a sequence $x_j \in M_2$ such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} d(x_j) = \inf_{M_2} dist(x, M_1)$ and we have that

$$|\nabla^{M_2} d|(x_j) < \frac{1}{j} \quad e \quad \Delta^{M_2} d(x_j) > -\frac{1}{j}, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{19}$$

Suppose that M_2 lies on the mean convex side of M_1 and that $dist(M_1, M_2) = 0$. Then M_2 have an ideal contact at infinity with M_1. This way, for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently larg, the equation (5) in the demonstration of the Lema 3.1 give us that

$$\Delta^{M_2} d(x_j) - n|\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| + \sum_i^n \lambda_i(d_j) - \frac{II_{d_j}((\nabla^{M_2} d)^T, (\nabla^{M_2} d)^T)}{1 - |\nabla^{M_2} d|^2}(x_j) \leq 0 \tag{20}$$

where $\lambda_i(d_j)$ are the main curvatures of the parallel hypersurface $d^{-1}(d_j)$ in the orientation given by η and $d_j = d(x_j)$. As we have that $\Delta^{M_2} d(x_j) > -\frac{1}{j}$ then (20) give us that

$$\frac{1}{j} > -n|\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| + \sum_i^n \lambda_i(d_j) - \frac{II_{d_j}((\nabla^{M_2} d)^T, (\nabla^{M_2} d)^T)}{1 - |\nabla^{M_2} d|^2}. \tag{21}$$

And from $|\nabla^{M_2} d|(x_j) < \frac{1}{j}$ we have that

$$\frac{|II_{d_j}((\nabla^{M_2} d)^T, (\nabla^{M_2} d)^T)|}{1 - |\nabla^{M_2} d|^2} \leq \|II_{d_j}\| \frac{|\nabla^{M_2} d|^2}{1 - |\nabla^{M_2} d|^2} < \|II_{d_j}\| \frac{1}{j^2 - 1}.$$

Then, from (21)

$$\begin{aligned} \|II_{d_j}\| \frac{1}{j^2 - 1} + \frac{1}{j} &> \sum_i^n \lambda_i(d_j) - n|\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| \\ &\geq \sum_i^n \lambda_i - n|\mathbf{H}_{M_2}|. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

As $j \to \infty$ in (22), we have, by Lemma 4.1, that $n|\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| \geq \lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n$ contradicting (18). Thus, M_2 cannot lie in the convex side of M_1 if $dist(M_1, M_2) = 0$.

Notice that from (18) we have that the mean curvature of M_1 is positive. Thus, if M_2 lies on the mean convex side of M_1 and $dist(M_1, M_2) > 0$ we can proceed as in the second paragraph of the demonstration of the Theorem 4.1 will lead to the same contradiction. □

The Theorem 4.3 is still valid if $M_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ is a hypersurface with positive mean curvature and $M_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ a n-submanifold embedded.

Remark 4.2. *Let M a oriented hypersurface isometrically imersed in Riemannian space form $\mathbb{M}_c^{n+1}$. If R_M is the normalized scalar curvature of M*

and A its shape operator, then from Gauss equation we have the following relationship, see for instance [15],

$$\|A\|^2 = n^2H_M^2 - n(n-1)(R_M - c).$$

Therefore, if $R_M \geq c$ we have to $\|A\|^2 \leq n^2H_M^2$, and so $\|A\| \leq nH_M$, if $H_M > 0$. Then if the mean curvature of M is bounded will

$$\sup_M \|A\| \leq n \sup_M H_M < \infty.$$

With the Remark 4.2, the Theorem 4.3 give us the following corollary.

Corollary 4.1. *Let M_1 and M_2 as in Theorem 4.3. Assume that M_2 is complete with Ricci curvature bounded below. Let R_{M_1} the scalar curvature (normalized) of M_1 and suppose that $R_{M_1} \geq 0$. Suppose also that H_{M_1} is bounded and that*

$$\sup_{M_2} |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| < \inf_{M_1} \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n).$$

Then M_2 it connot lie in the convex side of M_1.

Proof. Suppose M_2 lies in the convex side of M_1 and that $dist(M_1, M_2) = 0$. Let II_{d_j} be the second fundamental form of the parallel hypersurface $d^{-1}(d_j)$, where $d_j = d(x_j) = dist(x_j, M_1)$ and $x_j \in M_2$ is a sequence of points given by Omori-Yau, i.e., with $d_j \to 0$ satisfying (19). Then accordingly with the Remark 4.2 and by Lemma 4.1, we have $\lim_{j\to\infty} \|II_{d_j}\| < \infty$. Proceeding like the demonstration of Theorem 4.3 we have the desired. □

If $M_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$, $k \geq 2$, is a hypersurface properly embedded and $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n$ are its n first main curvatures with relation to the unit normal η, then the corollary 4.2 tells us that the n-submanifold $M_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ properly embedded and disjoint from M_1 cannot have an asymptotic approximation of M_1.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $M_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$, $k \geq 2$, a hypersurface without boundary, properly embedded, with bounded mean curvature and scalar curvature (normalized) $R_{M_1} \geq 0$. Let also $M_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ a n-dimensional C^2-submanifold without boundary, complete, properly embedded and with Ricci curvature bounded below. Suppose that*

$$\sup_{M_2} |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| < \inf_{M_1} \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n).$$

If M_2 lies in the side of M_1 that the normal η points and they are disjoints, then

$$dist(M_1, M_2) > 0. \tag{23}$$

Notice that on demonstration of Theorem 4.3 the hypothesis about M_2 are essentially so that we can use the Omori-Yau maximum principle on function $d(x) = dist(x, M_1)$. Thus, we can suppose others hypothesis on M_2 allowing us to use this principle. This can be done using the Pigola-Rigoli-Setti's Theorem, see [16], which extends the class of Riemannian manifolds for which

hold the Omori-Yau maximum principle. Before, however, we give the following definition given by Pigola-Rigoli-Setti also in [16].

Definition 4.1. *The Omori-Yau maximum principles is said to hold on Riemannian manifold M if for any given $u \in C^2(M)$ with $u^* = \sup_M u < \infty$, there exist a sequence of points $x_j \in M$, depending on M and on u, such that*

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} u(x_j) = u^*, \;\; |\nabla^M u|(x_j) < \frac{1}{j}, \;\; \Delta^M u(x_j) < \frac{1}{j}.$$

Theorem 4.4 (Pigola-Rigoli-Setti)**.** *Let M a Riemannian manifold and assume there exists a non-negative function γ satisfying the following:*

C1) $\gamma(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \infty$;

C2) $\exists B > 0$ such that $|\nabla^M \gamma| \leq B\sqrt{\gamma}$ off a compact set;

C3) $\exists C > 0$ such that $\Delta^M \gamma \leq C\sqrt{\gamma G(\sqrt{\gamma})}$ off a compact set, were $G : [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty)$ is a smooth function satisfying

$$G(0) > 0, \;\; G'(0) \geq 0, \;\; \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{ds}{\sqrt{G(s)}} = +\infty, \;\; \limsup_{t\to+\infty} \frac{tG(\sqrt{t})}{G(t)} < +\infty.$$

Then the Omori-Yau maximum principle holds on M.

Because of the Theorem of Pigola-Rigoli-Setti, Theorem 4.4 above, the Corollary 4.1 it can be to extended to a class more general of Riemannian manifold what satisfy the Maximum principle of Omori-Yau. We have then the

Theorem 4.5. *Let M_1 and M_2 be two disjoints hypersurfaces, without boundary and properly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Let R_{M_1} the scalar curvature (normalized) of M_1 and suppose that $R_{M_1} \geq 0$. Suppose also that the mean curvature of M_1 is bounded and that*

$$\sup_{M_2} |\mathbf{H}_{M_2}| < \inf_{M_1} \frac{1}{n}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n).$$

If there exist a non-negative function in M_2 satisfying the conditions $C1)$, $C2)$ and $C3)$ of Theorem 4.4, then M_2 it cannot lie in the convex side of M_1.

REFERENCES

[1] Ronaldo F. de Lima;A Maximum Principle at Infinity for Surfaces with Constant Mean Curvature in Euclidean Space; Annals of Global Analysis and Geometry 20, 325–343, 2001.

[2] Ronaldo F. de Lima, William H. Meeks III, A Maximum Principle at Infinity for Surfaces with Bounded Mean Curvature in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and $\mathbb{H}^3$, Indiana Journal of Math, 53:5, 1211-1223 (2004)

[3] Ulrich Dierkes · Dirk Schwab; Maximum principles for submanifolds of arbitrary codimension and bounded mean curvature; Calc. Var. 22, 173–184 (2005)

[4] Langevin, R. and Rosenberg, H.: A maximum principle at infinity for minimal surfaces and applications, Duke Math. J. 57 (1988), 819–829.
[5] Jorge, L.P., Tomi, F.: The barrier principle for minimal submanifolds of arbitrary codimenson. Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom. 24, 261–267 (2003)
[6] Gilbarg, D., Trudinger, N.S.: Elliptic partial diferential equations of second order. Springer Grundlehren
[7] F. Fontenele and Sérgio L. Silva; A Tangency Principle and Applications; Illinois Journal of Mathematics Volume 45, Number 1, Spring 2001, Pages 213-228
[8] Soret, M.: Maximum principle at infinity for complete minimal surfaces in flat 3-manifolds, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. 13 (1995), 101–116.
[9] Antonio Ros e Harold Rosenberg: Properly embedded surfaces whit constant mean curvature, American Journal of Mathematics, Volume 132, Number 6, December 2010, pp. 1429-1443.
[10] Meeks,W. and Rosenberg, H.: The maximum principle at infinity in flat 3-manifolds, Comment. Math. Helv. 65 (1990).
[11] H. Omori, Isometric immersions of Riemannian manifolds. J. Math. Soc. Japan 19 (2), 1967.
[12] Isaac Chavel, Riemannian Geometry : A Modern Introduction, Second Edition. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics.
[13] Debora Impera, Stefano Pigola and Alberto G. Setti, Global Maximum Principles and Divergence Theorems on Complete Manifolds with Boundary, arXiv:1303.2853v2.
[14] Eschenburg, J.H. Comparison Theorems and Hypersurfaces. Manuscripta Mathematica, v. 59, nº 3, p. 295-323, 1987.
[15] Luis J. Alias, S. Carolina García-Martínez, Marco Rigoli. A maximum principle for hypersurfaces with constant scalar curvature and applications, Ann Glob Anal Geom (2012) 41:307–320.
[16] S. Pigola, M. Rigoli, A. G. Setti, Maximum Principles on Riemannian Manifolds and Applications. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, no. 822.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA-UFRPE, 52171-900 - RECIFE/PE, BRASIL.
E-mail address: jose.dsilva@ufrpe.br

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA-UFPE, 50670-901, RECIFE/PE, BRASIL.
E-mail address: tsousa@dmat.ufpe.br